

**CITY OF PLATTSBURGH  
PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
MAY 28, 2014**

Chairman Rotella called the City of Plattsburgh Planning Board Meeting to order at 7:00 PM

**PRESENT:** Joseph Rotella  
Craig Worley  
Bill Ferris  
Jim Abdallah  
Curt Gervich  
Gerald Hofmaister

**ALSO PRESENT:** Kevin Farrington, P.E., City Engineer

**ABSENT:** Karen Ricketson, Mark Tiffer (Alt.)

**PB#2014-08** James Moser, Moser Engineering

The Chairman reminded Mr. Moser that there were only 5 Planning Board members present and the applicants needs 4 positive votes for a motion to pass.

**First Item on the Agenda: PB# 2014-08: 83 Oak Street.**

- A. Short Form SEQR.
- B. **SITE PLAN REVIEW:** Review church new addition and site renovations.  
**APPLICANT:** New Jerusalem Baptist Church. **PLAN PREPARER:** Moser Engineering

For the purpose of this meeting, the below 7 drawings were prepared by Moser Engineering, 73 Bugby Road, Chazy, NY 12921 and titled:

- "Site Plan for New Jerusalem Baptist Church Building Addition & Site Renovations," 83 Oak Street, Plattsburgh, NY 12901, Drawing C1 dated 10-25-13; Revised 1-9-14, 2-5-14, 4-10-14, 5-15-14, Project 13-41.
- "Grading Plan for New Jerusalem Baptist Church Building Addition & Site Renovations," 83 Oak Street, Plattsburgh, NY 12901, Drawing C2 dated 10-25-13; Revised 5-15-14, Project 13-41

- “Lighting, Utility & Landscape Plan, New Jerusalem Baptist Church Building Addition & Site Renovations,” 83 Oak Street, Plattsburgh, NY 12901, Drawing C3 dated 10-25-13, Revised 5-15-14, Project 13-41.
- “Elevation Views for New Jerusalem Baptist Church Building Addition & Site Renovations,” 83 Oak Street, Plattsburgh, NY 12901, Drawing E1 dated 3-13-14; Revised 5-15-14, Project 13-41.
- “Details for New Jerusalem Baptist Church Building Addition & Site Renovations,” 83 Oak Street, Plattsburgh, NY 12901, Dated 5-13-14, Drawing D1.
- “1<sup>st</sup> Floor Plan for New Jerusalem Baptist Church Building Addition & Site Renovations,” 83 Oak Street, Plattsburgh, NY 12901, Drawing A1 dated 3-13-14; Revised 5-15-14, Project 13-41.
- “2<sup>nd</sup> Floor Plan for New Jerusalem Baptist Church Building Addition & Site Renovations,” 83 Oak Street, Plattsburgh, NY 12901, Drawing A2 dated 3-13-14, Revised 5-15-14, Project 13-41.

Mr. Moser: I received the letter from the last meeting indicating what the Board would like to see revised.

The parking lot lighting fixture detail and catalog sheet have been provided.

On C-3, I've revised the note to say the pole would be 14' tall, which was the 2<sup>nd</sup> bullet item. I added the 1 point foot-candle boundary but this one has the .5 up to the 5.

Cur and sidewalk detail sheets have been added, along with shrub planting, the handicap signage and the light pole detail.

The sidewalk on the Oak Street side will be removed and will receive topsoil and seed.

We are now proposing a couple bollards with a piece of chain link across the entrance to prevent vehicles from accessing when no one is there.

We will revise the sidewalk in front of the handicap spots and has been extended to the north to encompass the 2<sup>nd</sup> handicap parking spot. I added a sidewalk to the stairway that goes up to the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor.

I did do a couple of PERK tests. Please refer to the C-2 sheet. The PERK rate was actually better. I was able to bring the ditch up ½ of a foot. The levels of that basin are shown in the infiltration basin detail. It won't get quite up to the 198 contour for a 100 year storm. It should all be contained within that.

Running off these numbers does not require a dry well. It should be able to handle a 100 year storm and have it infiltrate back in.

Mr. Farrington: Questioned the recording of the rate.

Mr. Moser: A 3 minute PERK rate, 20 inches per hour.

Mr. Farrington: Questioned what he found in terms of the volume of the swale and PERK rate and the ability to detain volume and run off.

Mr. Moser: The infiltration basin detail on the bottom of C2 – that basin should fill up to the 197.57 contour, which is just .07.

Mr. Farrington: Is that just the volume of the rain or does that factor in the PERK rate?

Mr. Moser: He ran through hydrocad. He explained further. [Meter 5:00].

Mr. Farrington: So this basically would hold 100 year storm.

Mr. Moser: That 100 year storm shouldn't get above the 198, which you can see 199 and 200 closer to the property line. It should be contained within the basin.

Mr. Worley: So the driveway is lower than your boundary lines.

Mr. Moser: Yes 200 closer to the building then it drops off slowly than more to the ditch than back up.

Mr. Worley: So everything is draining to the back.

Mr. Moser: Yes to the South and to the West and should be contained within that L-shaped ditch. If it did overflow, it would stay within the parking lot or to Elm or Oak Street. It shouldn't impact the neighbors. [Further explanation by Mr. Moser.]

Mr. Farrington: The ditch on the side driveways is only 198 down to 197. It's less than a 1 foot drop. It has a 3 on 1 side-slope.

Mr. Moser: Agreed. It will be a shallow swale to catch the water. I do have a sample of the siding. (Applicant passed around samples of vinyl siding, LV smart side, and cement board). Colors would probably be country red.

Mr. Abdallah: Is the owner open to using anyone of those 3?

Mr. Moser: They prefer the vinyl due to the cost of the other 2. The other 2 are 2-1/2 times the cost of vinyl.

Mr. Farrington: What is the total cost for the siding?

Mr. Moser: For 3,000 SF for vinyl would be around \$3,000. \$10 – 12,000 for the other 2 samples.

Mr. Gervich: Stated the house across the street has a wooden picket fence.

Mr. Moser: We could make it 6 x 6 and have an eye for the chain to come across.

Mr. Gervich: I would like to see something other than chain link.

Mr. Worley: Questioned the north west side of the original building where there is a 6" clapboard and didn't know if the applicant was considering keeping it the same or replacing that at the same time as well. You will have 3 different treatments on the outside.

Mr. Moser: They can look into matching. I don't believe they were planning on it.

Mr. Ferris: At least not immediately.

Mr. Moser: Right.

Mr. Ferris: Maybe down the road. It all looks like it needs a little doctoring.

Mr. Worley: There was some rotted pieces on it. It looks like Pine to me.

Mr. Ferris: Questioned that 8' would be wide enough for the driveway and seemed minimal.

Mr. Moser: It's only one-way and it's basically for dropping off people.

Mr. Ferris: On the C3 diagram, it shows the existing trees. The tree closest to the white building that one will most likely have to come down. Even the front tree. We want to keep them but not at the detriment to the building where a big limb could come off and crash into the roof.

Mr. Moser: It will definitely have to be trimmed. There is talk about keeping them.

Mr. Gervich: I wonder if the fence is necessary at all because there is no fence on the one-way driveway.

Mr. Worley: It's not a fence, it's a chain and it will be removed when they are using it and then put across the driveway. [Meter 14:37] Commented on the plowing.

Mr. Abdallah: I'm all for trees but if the construction won't support the tree, I would just as soon see the tree go.

Mr. Moser: Most like that tree will come down.

Mr. Abdallah: On your light pole, that's a 14' total height?

Mr. Moser: Yes.

Mr. Abdallah: That's a previous comment. It's an 11' light pole on a 3' base, for a total of 14'.

Mr. Moser: So the light would be at the 14'.

Mr. Rotella: Questioned the Board on the siding?

Mr. Ferris: This is not a historic district.

Mr. Rotella: I would say vinyl but in the trade off do the other side with the vinyl too so it matches.

Mr. Moser: Match the addition – yes. There is a lot of other buildings that are vinyl in the area.

Mr. Rotella: The North side the clapboard is really in despair. That is my thought.

Mr. Moser: That's a fair trade-off.

Mr. Worley: I tend to agree with you.

Mr. Abdallah: I would generally agree with that as well. We are not in a historic district.

**MOTION ON SF SEQR:**

***To have a negative declaration;***

***By Mr. Ferris;***

***Seconded by Mr. Hofmaiser***

***All in Favor: 5***

***Opposed: 0***

***Motion passed***

**MOTION ON SITE PLAN:**

**For the approval of the addition to 83 Oak Street, New Jerusalem Baptist Church, as per submitted plans, with their choice of exterior siding treatments for the building with the similar color to match existing brick, also to match the old addition on the Northwest side of the building with the same siding that they do with the new addition,**

**By Mr. Ferris,  
Seconded by Mr. Worley**

Discussion:

Mr. Moser: So basically the only provision of the plan will be the siding – addition siding to match.

The Board clarified the “northwest side to match the addition with the color red.”

**All in Favor: 5  
Opposed: 0  
Motion passed.**

**MOTION:**

**To Approve the April 28, 2014 Minutes**

**By Mr. Abdallah,  
Seconded by Mr. Worley**

**All in Favor  
Motion Passed**

Short discussion on the approval of the window replacement and SHIPO letter regarding replacing windows around the oval area. [Meter 21:00]

*Motion:*

*To Adjourn:*

*By Mr. Worley, seconded by Mr. Gervich*

**Adjourned: 7:24 PM**

For the purpose of this meeting, Denise Nephew, Secretary to the Engineering Department was present at this meeting and transcribed these minutes, which are a true and accurate description of the meeting.

Respectfully Submitted, Denise Nephew, Engineering & Planning Board Secretary